

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MAY 31, 2016

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Pitts, Shaw, LaPointe, Campbell, Haff, O'Brien, Fedler, Gang, Skellie

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None

SUPERVISORS: Henke, Hicks, Moore, Suprenant, Hogan

Sandy Huffer, Deputy Clerk

Roger Wickes, County Attorney

Chris DeBolt, County Administrator

Al Nolette, County Treasurer

Steve Haskins, DPW Superintendent
Public

Joe Brilling, Exec. Dir. SD#2

AGENDA AS PRESENTED IN COMMITTEE NOTICE:

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Minutes – April 26, 2016
3. Department Reports/Requests:
 - A. Sewer District
 - 1) Sewer District No. 1
 - a) Request Budget Amendment to Cover Legal Expenses
 - b) Sewer Dist. No. 1 Property Sale Update
 - c) 2016 CFA Application Update
 - 2) Sewer District No. 2
 - a) Request Budget Amendment – Drifting Ridge Pump Station Rehab
 - B. Department of Public Works
 - 1) Dewatering Facility Access Road Update – Discussion with EPA
 - 2) Draft Report – White Creek Watershed Study
 - 3) Project Updates – CR10/CR113/Lower Turnpike/Center Falls Bridge Projects
 - 4) Discussion on Municipal Center Paving Project
4. Other Business
5. Adjournment

Chairman Pitts called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

A motion to accept the minutes of the April 26, 2016 meeting was moved by Mr. Gang, seconded by Mr. O'Brien and adopted.

SEWER DISTRICT – Joe Brilling, Executive Director Sewer District, addressed the following items:
Sewer District No. 1:

- Budget Amendment Legal Expenses – Requesting a budget amendment for \$3,000 for legal expenses to examine extending the boundaries of SD #1, possibly take over Kingsbury District #1. There is no intermunicipal agreement so no preventive maintenance is being done on the sewer system. SD#1 taking over Kingsbury Sewer District #1 would simplify the system. It was asked why we don't just give Washington County Sewer District #1 to the Town of Kingsbury. Mr. Brilling stated Kingsbury does not have the employees or equipment to do this maintenance. There are no employees associated with SD#1. He proposes an intermunicipal agreement be developed between SD#1 and SD#2 to perform the needed preventive maintenance. The legal expenses will be used to take steps to change the original documents that created SD #1 and rewrite the way billing is done. Mr. Hogan stated after discussions with Mr. Brilling, this seemed the simplest, most efficient way to do this. A motion to approve forwarding a budget amendment for Sewer District #1, increasing legal fees by \$3,000 from fund balance to the Finance Committee, was moved by Mr. O'Brien, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.
- Sewer District No. 1 Property Sale Update – Joe discussed this with Warren Washington IDA. SD#1 used to have a treatment plant that was decommissioned in 2001. This property, owned by Sewer District #1, is surrounded by property owned by the IDA. The IDA

wasn't interested in paying fair market value for the property. Joe told the IDA if anyone is interested in the Sewer District #1 property, they should be referred to him.

- 2016 CFA Application Update – Have previously discussed sewer line and manhole rehab project. He reached out to an engineering firm for a price for a substantiating report to submit with the CFA and help researching potential funding sources. He recently became aware that the county may start to require RFP's for professional services. There isn't enough time to do an official RFP to have the report done in time for CFA submission. Joe is going to get prices from a few other engineering firms and report back to the committee next month.

Sewer District No. 2:

- Budget Amendment – Drifting Ridge Pump Station Rehab – Not needed, it was already done.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – Steve Haskins, Superintendent of Public Works, addressed the following items with the committee:

- Dewatering Facility Access Road – Discussion with EPA – In attendance from the USEPA - David King; NYS Canal Corp. – Gary Tatro, Asst. Division Canal Engineer, Eastern Division, James Candiloru, Director Environmental Affairs, David Boshart, Real Property Division. Mr. King stated that the EPA owns the road. It was built by GE. The road can be transferred to the county by a letter and the county would get what the EPA took. Chairman Pitts asked why would the County use \$3 million in taxpayer funds to fix a driveway for a private business. Mr. Suprenant stated that those costs would be incurred over several years. He added that the county has already got \$4M in taxes from it and he doesn't see where the county will have to put any money in it for the next ten years, except for plowing, which can be covered from additional CHIPS funds. Chairman Pitts asked if a guarantee in writing that the bridge will last ten to fifteen years would be provided. Bob Manz of WCC stated that the bridge manufacturer has provided documentation multiple times as to the condition of the bridge. Mr. Hicks asked Mr. King what the procedure is for the EPA to return the property taken. Mr. King stated that first it is offered to Canal Corp. and he added that Canal Corp. has no interest in the road. Canal Corp. representatives concurred that they don't want the road. They have access to the lock and wharf area from East Street, which was the original access area and is going to be restored. Mr. Haff asked if the East Street access could be used to get to the dewatering facility. Mr. Suprenant stated that the Village roads are not built for it. Mr. King added that the EPA's need was to get the facility built, get the project done and added that removing the infrastructure at the end of the project would be short sighted. Mr. Haff stated he agreed but the question is who should be responsible for the road. It doesn't have to be the county. Mr. King was asked if the Canal Corp., County, Towns of Fort Edward and Kingsbury all say they don't want it, what happens. Mr. King stated if all of the entities pass on taking the road, the state of New York has to take it. Mr. Boshart of the Canal Corp. Real Property Division stated that it could end up being classified as unappropriated state land and be under the jurisdiction of the Office of General Services. Mr. Haff noted that the EPA didn't take the land owned by the Webb family and without the easement through the property, if a municipality took the road, they couldn't access it. Mr. Manz stated that it is a permanent easement that has been filed and worst case scenario is a permanent easement would be maintained. Best case scenario and what is planned, is that WCC has a purchase agreement in front of Mary Webb to buy the property from her and it would be transferred to the agency that takes over the road. Mr. Haff stated that he understands WCC and EPA don't want to discuss the temporary bridge. Mr. Manz stated it is not a temporary bridge, it is a portable bridge designed to highway standards, interstate standards. He added that it should last longer than 20 years and has been in place for 8 years. He offered to provide documentation from the bridge manufacturer stating it was recently inspected and in excellent condition. Chairman Pitts asked what the committee wants to do. Mr. Suprenant stated that the bottom line is economic development. Mr. Hicks asked if Washington County doesn't take the road

over, does that mean there would be zero economic development there? Mr. Suprenant stated that there is a possibility that Kingsbury and Fort Edward could decide to take a portion of the road. If the state ends up with the property, Mr. Boshart stated that because of the access issues, it would probably stall any significant economic development for three to four years. He also added that he doesn't believe it is the state's intent to keep that open as a public road. Mr. Suprenant stated that if the County or the Towns of Fort Edward and Kingsbury don't take it over, economic development would be dead. Board Chairman Henke asked Mr. Hogan if the Town of Kingsbury has discussed this. Mr. Hogan stated Kingsbury has had limited discussions. The Town is waiting to see the county's move on it. Based on feedback he has received, he doesn't get a warm feeling that the Town would be willing to take the road. Mr. Hogan stated the Town of Kingsbury is concerned about heavy truck traffic nears schools and residential areas and will not see any tax benefit. He asked Mr. Haskins if he feels comfortable with what has been said about the temporary or portable bridge and with the road the way it's set up, with heavy trucks going over it long term. Mr. Haskins stated the bridge has already shown some deflection. There really hasn't been much heavy traffic on the bridge for some time now. Mr. Hogan added that he doesn't get the feeling that the DPW Superintendent is confident that the portable bridge is a long term solution and if the county has to incur those costs, how is that fair to the taxpayers? We can't make any guarantee on what future revenues we'll have six or eight years out. We have to work on behalf of the taxpayers and be careful about what we take on. Mr. Campbell asked Mr. Boshart if he can provide property boundaries of the parcel taken. Mr. Boshart stated there are surveys of the original taking adding that there were revisions done recently to the mapping. He stated the surveys can be provided. Mr. Campbell asked if the survey will show exact archeological spots near the dive culvert. Mr. Boshart stated everything done on Canal System is approved by SHPO. Mr. Hicks stated he finds it hard to believe that if the county doesn't take the road, the whole project falls apart. If it is a worthwhile project, it will happen. Mr. Shaw asked if the road has been officially offered to the Canal Corp. or the County? Mr. King stated DEC and Canal Corp. have officially declined taking the road. Roger Wickes stated no one has come forward and offered the parcels to the county. He added that easements are a still a problem because they terminate when GE turns over its interest, per the language. Mr. Manz disagrees with Mr. Wickes interpretation of that language. Mr. Manz stated there is another document held by GE that the county doesn't have that contains the assignment and lease payment language for the easement. Mr. Boshart asked Mr. King if the EPA granted the roadway to a municipality, is it granted as a roadway in perpetuity? Mr. King stated it is granted as the piece of property that they took. Mr. Wickes stated if the county took the parcel and it was to become a part of the county road system, it would have to be added to the county map. The county could only sell the parcel by public auction. Mr. Haff suggested the county declare we are not interested. A motion to not consider taking the property as a county road, was moved by Mr. Haff, seconded by Mr. Gang and adopted unanimously by roll call vote: AYES: (9) Pitts, Shaw, LaPointe, Campbell, Haff, O'Brien, Fedler, Gang, Skellie.

- White Creek Watershed Study – Steve stated he is not presenting the draft report at this point but did distribute handouts (on file) with Recommended Projects to Protect Infrastructure, Residences and Businesses from Future Flooding, one sheet with Upstream Alternatives and one with Salem Village Alternatives. Steve is reporting on the public meeting that took place on May 23rd at the Salem School. There was a good presentation done by Fitzgerald Associates. It was well received although a few in the crowd did not agree with the findings in the report. The purpose of the public meeting was to give the public input before the final report is issued. A lot of time was spent describing the process Fitzgerald went through to conduct the study. The most important finding that was revealed is the fact that there is no way to address a large flood situation in Salem. The study found the best we can hope for is to address moderate floods in the ten year storm range. There are very limited opportunities to make a significant impact. A 100 year flood means a 1% chance of happening in any given year and 10 year flood means a 10% chance of happening in any given year. Fitzgerald

Associates determined that Irene was a 100 year flood, a volume of 5,600 cubic feet per second. The study determined that the Archibald Street bridge can handle a 1 year to almost 2 year storm or 1,800 cubic feet per second. Salem Village Alternatives – Three deal with removal of the Archibald Street bridge. These alternatives include removal of the north abutment which costs would not be covered by remaining funds from the Empire State Development grant, which will only allow removal of the bridge deck. The study indicates that taking off the deck and leaving the abutment will not help much. We would have to ask ESD permission to be able to use those funds to remove the abutment. It could be a public safety issue removing the bridge. Removal of the bridge alone would not do enough to mitigate the flooding. A multitude of things need to be done including widening the channel, taking out the berms downstream. Mr. Campbell asked Chairman Pitts if the Town of Salem will give the county their recommendation. Chairman Pitts stated yes, once the report is final. There will be a 30 day comment period after the report is final. Installation of an overflow box culvert would require an easement from the property owner to create an overflow channel. There is \$193,000 left in the capital project budget and using those funds for anything other than taking off the bridge deck would require permission from ESD. The Treasurer stated that Steve was reluctant to ask for budget revisions for this project on the grant total until after the first payment has been made to us and Al reported that the first payment has been received. After the 30 comment period and a recommendation from the Town of Salem, Steve can request a change from ESD.

- Project Updates
 - CR 10 Bridge Replacement Project – This is shared with the State of Vermont. The design is ongoing. Has a meeting tomorrow with Vermont DOT to discuss cultural resources. Scheduled for construction in 2018.
 - CR 113 Bridge Replacement Project – Just got the sign off from the three Indian tribes. Waiting for a response from SHPO and the design can continue. Scheduled for construction in 2017.
 - Lower Turnpike and Center Falls Bridge Painting Projects – Just had kick off meeting with DOT and designer. Expect to have design done this summer, letting in the fall and construction done in 2017.
 - Church Street Bridge – This was submitted as part of the Bridge New York program which is competitive. Steve stated that New York State has come to terms with the MTA, so he expects to hear soon what projects are included in the Bridge New York program.
 - CR 16 Bridge Over Halfway Brook – The Treasurer asked about the status of this project, reporting that there is \$10,000 left in the project. Steve stated that it is complete but is not sure if there are any outstanding expenses. He will check and get back to Al. If the project is ready to close, a resolution will be brought to Finance.
- Municipal Center Paving Project – Harrison asked Steve for an estimate for materials to pave the area between the carports at the Sheriff's office. They also looked at the area between the highway shop and Route 4. He gave an estimate to Harrison. There has been talk of a municipal center paving project. Steve could have the engineers review the whole parking lot. He is asking the committee if that's something they want him and the engineers to get involved in. The estimate for the area at the Sheriff's office was about \$17,000 for materials, with DPW doing the work. Mr. Campbell stated if we want to pave the entire parking lot, we have to have a plan. This could involve temporary parking areas. Paving the area at the Sheriff's office and the area between the highway shop and Route 4 should take about a week. Steve suggested the committee consider hiring a consultant if the County wants to add additional parking or reconfigure the entire municipal center parking lot. Mr. O'Brien suggested proceed paving the area at the Sheriff's office and the area by the highway shop. Mrs. Fedler suggested doing the study. A motion to direct Steve and Harrison to develop an RFP for a study for the municipal center parking lot, was moved by Mr. O'Brien, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- Has 30 boxes of very lightweight welding rod that was bought back when Mr. Wheeler was Superintendent. Hasn't been used and will not be used. He would like to declare it surplus and give it to BOCES. A motion to declare the welding rod surplus and give to BOCES, moved by Mrs. Fedler, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.
- The owner of property, Mary Haynes, adjacent to county property in the Town of Fort Ann wants to log her property (map on file). The only access is through County property, Tripoli pit. The logging would be done in the winter. Steve doesn't have a problem with it. No objections were raised by the committee. There were three other county-owned parcels on the map, (14.5 acres, 15 acres and 31.16 acres) that Mr. Haff suggested the county get rid of.
- The first of the two military trucks is together. It's not ready to plow snow yet. He is going to have it brought to the front of the building so the Supervisors can look at it after the meeting.
- Roger Wickes reported that the County is the guardian for a woman who owns a home on the non village side of the Church Street bridge in Granville. The woman's assets have to be liquidated in order that she be taken care of. She is not living in it. Normally the property would be put on the market and sold. When Tammy DeLorme talked to the real estate agent, they stated it is not worth much suggesting a purchase price between \$25,000 to \$29,000 and probably should be torn down. Tammy reached out to Steve to see if it is a property the county would be interested in. Roger added that it would require the court's permission to buy it and we'd have to have it appraised. Steve felt it would be beneficial to the County. Roger will pursue this further.

A motion to adjourn was moved, seconded and adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 12:34.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sandy Huffer, Deputy Clerk,
Washington County Board of Supervisors*